To - Ed Wickham

PHILIP MORRIS U.S.A. INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

120 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

File

FYI

TO: Mr. Shepard P. Pollack DATE: April 13, 1983

FROM: Carolyn Levy

Carolyn

RECEIVED
APR 15 1983
J. E. WICKHAM

SUBJECT: March, 1983, FTC Tar, Nicotine and Carbon Monoxide Listing

Market Sample # 26

The FTC has issued a report on the tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide (CO) deliveries of 208 varieties of cigarettes available in the marketplace from December, 1981, through February, 1982.

Table I lists Philip Morris brands' FTC numbers from the current report as well as the March and December, 1981, reports. All reported changes in tar since the December listing were due to manufacturing variability and/or variability in the FTC method. Although the 11 mg tar delivery reported for Merit 100 is 1 mg above specification, C.I. field pick-ups in late 1981 and early 1982 yielded tar deliveries all within specification as do analyses of current production. Modifications in cigarette design are currently being implemented to lower the tar deliveries of B&H 100 regular and menthol, Marlboro 85, Marlboro 100 and Marlboro 100 (HP) to meet a 16 mg specification. The tar specification for Cambridge 100 was changed from 4 to 5 mg in May, 1982. In September, 1982, the tar of Marlboro Menthol 85 was raised to 16 mg.

Table II lists Philip Morris' full flavor packings and major competitive brands. The tar deliveries of all brands remained essentially unchanged since the last FTC report.

Table III lists Philip Morris' low tar packings and major competitive brands. Five new packings, four menthol and one nonmenthol, have been introduced since the previous FTC pick-up in April, 1981. No major changes in the tar deliveries of any brands, except Lark Lights 85 and 100mm, were noted.

Table IV lists Philip Morris' ultra low tar packings and major competitive brands. Five new competitive menthol packings have been introduced since the last FTC pick-up. The number of lowest tar (< 0.5mg) brands decreased to six from a high of ten in the previous report (B&H regular, HP, not shown in Table IV).

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

Table V is a copy of the FTC's report listing tar, nicotine and CO deliveries for all 208 packings tested. On June 25, 1982, the FTC determined that the present FTC testing methodology does not accurately measure the tar, nicotine and CO deliveries of Barclay cigarettes. Brown & Williamson brought suit the same day to challenge the Commission's action and to prevent further FTC action pending the outcome of the suit. The suit was dismissed by the federal district court in Louisville, and B&W's appeal is now awaiting a decision. The appellate court recently dissolved the interim injunction, and it is expected that the FTC will, among other things, amend its reports to delete the results for Barclay. The FTC also suspects that the smoke deliveries of Kool Ultra 85's and 100's may be inaccurately measured. However, no decision on these packings has been reached to date. Because of the controversy surrounding the Barclay and Kool Ultra packings the test results for these cigarettes are marked with asterisks.

Carolyn Levy

CL:js

cc: Mr. J. Bowling
Mr. H. Cullman
Mr. J. F. Cullman 3rd
Mr. C. H. Goldsmith
Mr. T. T. Goodale
Mr. A. Holtzman
Mr. J. T. Landry
Mr. J. E. Lincoln
Mr. H. Maxwell
Mr. R. R. Millhiser
Mr. J. J. Morgan
Mr. F. E. Resnik
Mr. G. Weissman

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE I

PHILIP MORRIS BRANDS

		Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
		3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
Alpine		14	14	15	0.9	0.9	1.0	14	13	15
B&H regular (HP)	**	1	<0.5	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	2	1	1
B&H 85 (HP)	**	16	15	16	1.2	1.2	1.3	13	12	13
B&H 100 (HP)		16	16	15	1.1	1.1	1.1	15	16	16
B&H 100, menthol (HP)		16	16	16	1.1	1.0	1.1	15	15	16
+B&H 100	**	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	16	16
+B&H 100, menthol	**	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	17	17
B&H Lts 100 (HP)	**	11	10	-	0.8	0.7	-	13	11	-
B&H Lts 100, menthol (HP)	**	11	10	-	0.8	0.7	-	12	11	-
+B&H Lights 100	**	11	10	10	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	13	13
+B&H Lights 100, menthol	**	11	10	10	0.8	0.7	0.8	12	12	12
+Cambridge 85 (HP)		<0.5	<0.5	-	<0.05	<0.05	-	1	<0.5	-
Cambridge 85	**	1	<0.5	-	0.1	0.1	-	1	1	-
++Cambridge 100		3	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	5	5	-
English Ovals reg (HP)		23	23	22	1.7	1.7	1.7	12	12	12
English Ovals 85 (HP)	*	27	28	28	2.0	2.1	2.3	13	15	14
Galaxy 85	**	16	14	16	1.0	1.0	1.0	16	13	17
Marlboro 80 (HP)		16	16	16	1.1	1.0	1.0	15	14	15
Marlboro 80, menthol (HP)		15	15	15	0.9	0.9	1.0	14	14	13
+Marlboro 85	**	17	16	16	1.1	1.0	1.1	15	15	16
++Marlboro 85, menthol	**	15	14	14	0.9	0.9	0.9	14	14	14
+Marlboro 100 (HP)	**	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	17	16	16
+Marlboro 100	**	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	16	16
Marlboro Lights 85 (HP)		10	10	-	0.7	0.7	-	12	12	-
Marlboro Lights 85		11	11	11	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	12	13
+Marlboro Lights 100	**	11	10	11	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	12	14

+Tar and nicotine deliveries in advertising will change to values listed in this report.
++Tar and nicotine deliveries in advertising will not change. Values listed will be "by FTC Method".

*Brand decreased in tar from last report.
**Brand increased in tar from last report.

PM3001060831

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE I (CONT'D)

PHILIP MORRIS BRANDS

		Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
		3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
Northwind 85		8	-	-	0.6	-	-	10	-	-
Northwind 100		9	-	-	0.6	-	-	11	-	-
+Merit 85	**	8	7	8	0.6	0.5	0.6	11	10	11
+Merit 85, menthol	**	8	7	7	0.6	0.5	0.5	10	10	10
+Merit 100	**	11	10	9	0.7	0.7	0.7	13	12	11
Merit 100, menthol		9	9	10	0.7	0.7	0.8	11	11	12
+Merit Ultra Lights 85	**	4	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	4	4	-
Merit Ultra Lts 85, menthol		3	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	4	4	-
Multifilter 85		12	12	11	0.8	0.8	0.8	12	11	11
Multifilter 85, menthol	*	11	12	12	0.8	0.8	0.8	10	11	12
+Parliament Lts 80 (HP)		9	9	8	0.6	0.6	0.6	9	10	9
Parliament Lights 85		9	9	9	0.7	0.6	0.7	11	10	10
Parliament Lights 100		12	12	11	0.9	0.9	0.9	11	11	11
Philip Morris 70	**	22	21	22	1.4	1.4	1.5	12	12	13
Philip Morris Commander 85	*	26	27	25	1.7	1.7	1.7	15	15	15
PM International 100 (HP)	**	18	16	17	1.1	1.1	1.2	16	16	18
PM Int'l 100, menthol (HP)		16	16	17	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	15	17
Players 70 (HP)	**	25	24	24	1.8	1.9	1.9	14	14	14
Saratoga 120 (HP)		15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	16	17
Saratoga 120, menthol (HP)		15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	16	15
Virginia Slims 100		15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.0	14	15	15
Virginia Slims 100, menthol		15	15	14	1.0	1.0	1.0	14	14	15
+Virginia Slims Lts 100 (HP)	**	9	7	8	0.7	0.6	0.6	9	8	9
+Virginia Slims Lts 100, menthol (HP)	**	8	7	9	0.6	0.6	0.7	8	8	10

+Tar and nicotine deliveries in advertising will change to values listed in this report.
++Tar and nicotine deliveries in advertising will not change. Values listed will be "by FTC Method".

*Brand decreased in tar from last report.
**Brand increased in tar from last report.

PM3001060832

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE II

COMPARISON WITH COMPETITIVE BRANDS

FULL FLAVOR IMAGE

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
80 mm BRANDS									
MARLBORO	16	16	16	1.1	1.0	1.0	15	14	15
Winston	16	16	18	1.0	1.1	1.3	16	15	17
80 mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
Kool	16	16	16	1.1	1.2	1.3	17	16	17
Newport	16	16	15	1.1	1.2	1.2	16	16	16
MARLBORO	15	15	15	0.9	0.9	1.0	14	14	13
85 mm BRANDS									
Old Gold	17	17	17	1.3	1.3	1.3	18	19	18
MARLBORO	17	16	16	1.1	1.0	1.1	15	15	16
Raleigh	16	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.0	17	17	18
Camel	15	16	19	1.0	1.2	1.4	15	16	19
Winston	15	15	19	1.0	1.1	1.4	16	16	19
Viceroy	15	15	15	0.9	1.0	1.0	17	16	17
L & M	15	14	15	1.0	1.0	1.0	15	15	16
85 mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
Newport	17	17	17	1.2	1.3	1.3	17	18	18
Kool	17	16	15	1.1	1.1	1.2	15	17	17
Salem	15	14	16	1.0	1.1	1.1	14	14	17
MARLBORO	15	14	14	0.9	0.9	0.9	14	14	14
ALPINE	14	14	15	0.9	0.9	1.0	14	13	15

PM3001060833

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE II (CONT'D)

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
100 mm BRANDS									
BENSON & HEDGES	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	16	16
MARLBORO	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	16	16
Raleigh	17	16	16	1.0	1.1	1.1	18	17	19
Pall Mall	16	17	17	1.2	1.3	1.3	16	17	17
L & M	15	15	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	16	17
Viceroy	15	15	15	1.0	1.1	1.1	18	16	18
Winston	14	14	18	1.0	1.0	1.4	14	14	19
100 mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
Newport	20	20	20	1.4	1.6	1.6	20	20	21
BENSON & HEDGES	17	16	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	16	17	17
Salem	15	15	19	1.1	1.1	1.5	14	14	18
Kool Super Longs	14	14	15	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	16	18
100 mm SLIMS									
Virginia Slims	15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.0	14	15	15
Virginia Slims, menthol	15	15	14	1.0	1.0	1.0	14	14	15

PM3001060834

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE III

COMPARISON WITH COMPETITIVE BRANDS

LOW TAR IMAGE

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
80-85 mm BOX BRANDS									
Kent	13	12	12	0.9	1.0	1.0	13	12	12
MARLBORO LIGHTS	10	10	-	0.7	0.7	-	12	12	-
PARLIAMENT LIGHTS	9	9	8	0.6	0.6	0.6	9	10	9
Camel Lights	8	6	-	0.7	0.6	-	8	7	-
85 mm BRANDS									
Kent	12	13	12	0.9	1.0	1.0	12	13	13
MARLBORO LIGHTS	11	11	11	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	12	13
Winston Lights	11	11	13	0.8	0.9	1.1	11	11	14
Vantage	9	9	10	0.7	0.7	0.8	13	13	15
PARLIAMENT LIGHTS	9	9	9	0.7	0.6	0.7	11	10	10
Raleigh Lights	9	8	9	0.7	0.7	0.7	10	11	10
Viceroy Rich Lights	9	8	8	0.7	0.7	0.7	10	10	10
L&M Lights	9	8	8	0.8	0.7	0.7	7	7	5
Camel Lights	8	8	10	0.7	0.7	0.9	10	10	11
MERIT	8	7	8	0.6	0.5	0.6	11	10	11
Golden Lights	8	7	8	0.7	0.7	0.8	9	8	8
85 mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
MULTIFILTER	11	12	12	0.8	0.8	0.8	10	11	12
Kool Milds	11	11	12	0.8	0.9	0.9	13	12	13
Vantage	9	10	10	0.6	0.7	0.8	13	14	15
Newport Lights	9	8	10	0.7	0.8	0.9	10	10	11
Belair	9	8	9	0.7	0.7	0.8	10	9	10
Golden Lights	9	8	8	0.8	0.7	0.7	9	8	8
Kool Lights	9	-	-	0.7	-	-	10	-	-
Salem Lights	8	8	11	0.6	0.6	0.9	11	10	13
MERIT	8	7	7	0.6	0.5	0.5	10	10	10

PM3001060835

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE III (CONT'D)

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
100 mm BRANDS									
Kent	14	14	15	1.1	1.2	1.1	13	13	14
Winston Lights	12	12	13	0.8	0.9	1.0	15	14	15
Camel Lights	12	12	12	0.8	0.9	1.0	15	15	15
MARLBORO LIGHTS	11	10	11	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	12	14
BENSON & HEDGES LIGHTS	11	10	10	0.8	0.7	0.8	13	13	13
MERIT	11	10	9	0.7	0.7	0.7	13	12	11
Raleigh Lights	10	9	8	0.8	0.8	0.8	13	13	11
Viceroy Rich Lights	10	9	8	0.8	0.8	0.7	12	12	11
Pall Mall Light	9	9	11	0.8	0.8	0.9	8	9	12
Golden Lights	9	8	9	0.8	0.8	0.7	9	9	8
Vantage	9	8	11	0.7	0.7	0.9	12	12	15
Decade	8	8	9	0.7	0.8	0.7	6	7	7
True	7	7	8	0.6	0.6	0.6	8	9	9
100mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
Kool Milds	12	12	12	0.9	1.0	1.0	14	13	13
BENSON & HEDGES LIGHTS	11	10	10	0.8	0.7	0.8	12	12	12
Kool Lights	11	-	-	0.9	-	-	11	-	-
Salem Lights	10	9	11	0.7	0.8	1.0	12	11	12
Newport Lights	9	-	-	0.8	-	-	10	-	-
Kool Super Lights	9	9	8	0.7	0.7	0.7	12	12	10
MERIT	9	9	10	0.7	0.7	0.8	11	11	12
Belair	9	8	8	0.7	0.6	0.7	11	10	9
Golden Lights	8	7	8	0.7	0.7	0.7	8	7	9
True	7	8	7	0.6	0.6	0.6	9	9	9
85 mm CHARCOAL BRANDS									
Lark	15	14	16	1.1	1.1	1.1	14	14	16
Tareyton	14	14	14	1.0	1.0	0.9	16	15	16
Lark Lights	14	7	8	1.0	0.6	0.6	13	7	8
Multifilter	12	12	11	0.8	0.8	0.8	12	11	11

PM3001060836

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE III (CONT'D)

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
100 mm CHARCOAL BRANDS									
Lark	16	16	17	1.2	1.2	1.2	15	15	19
Lark Lights	15	7	7	1.1	0.6	0.6	14	7	7
PARLIAMENT LIGHTS	12	12	11	0.9	0.9	0.9	11	11	11
Tareyton Long Lights	7	7	7	0.6	0.6	0.6	7	7	8
120 mm BRANDS									
More	17	18	22	1.2	1.4	1.7	21	20	24
More Menthol	16	18	22	1.2	1.5	1.8	19	20	24
SARATOGA	15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	16	17
SARATOGA MENTHOL	15	15	15	1.0	1.0	1.1	16	16	15
100 mm SLIMS									
VIRGINIA SLIMS LIGHTS	9	7	8	0.7	0.6	0.6	9	8	9
VIRGINIA SLIMS LTS, MENTHOL	8	7	9	0.6	0.6	0.7	8	8	10
More Lights	9	-	-	0.7	-	-	9	-	-
More Lights, Menthol	8	-	-	0.6	-	-	9	-	-

PM3001060837

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE IV

COMPARISON WITH COMPETITIVE BRANDS

ULTRA LOW TAR

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
80-85 mm BOX BRANDS									
Barclay	1	1	-	0.2	0.1	-	1	1	-
CAMBRIDGE	<0.5	<0.5	-	<0.05	<0.05	-	1	<0.5	-
Carlton	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	0.1	<0.05	0.1	<0.5	<0.5	1
Now	<0.5	<0.5	2	0.1	0.1	0.2	<0.5	<0.5	2
85 mm BRANDS									
Pall Mall Extra Light	6	6	7	0.6	0.5	0.6	7	6	7
Decade	5	5	5	0.5	0.4	0.4	5	4	3
True	5	4	5	0.4	0.4	0.4	5	5	5
Vantage Ultra Lights	4	6	6	0.4	0.5	0.5	5	9	9
Doral II	4	4	5	0.4	0.4	0.4	4	3	4
Winston Ultra	4	4	-	0.4	0.4	-	4	5	-
MERIT ULTRA LIGHTS	4	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	4	4	-
Triumph	2	3	3	0.3	0.4	0.4	2	3	3
Kent III	2	2	3	0.3	0.3	0.3	2	3	3
Now	1	2	2	0.1	0.2	0.3	1	3	3
Barclay	1	1	-	0.1	0.2	-	1	1	-
Carlton	1	<0.5	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	2	1	2
CAMBRIDGE	1	<0.5	-	0.1	0.1	-	1	1	-

PM3001060838

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001

TABLE IV (CONT'D)

	Tar, mg/cigt.			Nicotine, mg/cigt.			CO, mg/cigt.		
	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81	3/83	12/81	3/81
85 mm MENTHOL BRANDS									
Kool Super Lights	6	6	7	0.5	0.5	0.6	6	7	8
Decade	5	5	4	0.4	0.4	0.4	4	4	3
True	5	4	5	0.4	0.4	0.4	5	5	6
Salem Ultra	5	3	-	0.4	0.4	-	5	4	-
Doral II	4	4	5	0.4	0.4	0.4	3	3	4
MERIT ULTRA LIGHTS	3	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	4	4	-
Triumph	3	2	3	0.4	0.3	0.4	3	3	3
Kool Ultra	2	-	-	0.2	-	-	1	-	-
Now	1	2	2	0.1	0.2	0.2	1	3	3
Barclay	1	-	-	0.1	-	-	1	-	-
Carlton	<0.5	<0.5	1	0.1	0.1	0.1	1	1	1
100 mm BRANDS									
Winston Ultra	5	5	-	0.4	0.5	-	6	7	-
Kent III	5	4	4	0.5	0.5	0.5	6	7	6
Vantage Ultra Lights	4	5	-	0.4	0.5	-	5	8	-
Triumph	4	4	-	0.5	0.5	-	6	6	-
Carlton	4	4	4	0.4	0.4	0.4	6	6	6
CAMBRIDGE	3	3	-	0.3	0.3	-	5	5	-
Barclay	3	2	-	0.3	0.3	-	2	2	-
Now	2	1	-	0.2	0.2	-	2	1	-
Carlton (HP)	1	<0.5	-	0.1	0.1	-	1	1	-
Now (HP)	<0.5	<0.5	-	<0.05	<0.05	-	<0.5	<0.5	-
***100 mm MENTHOL BRANDS**									
Salem Ultra	5	4	-	0.4	0.4	-	6	5	-
Triumph	4	4	-	0.5	0.5	-	5	5	-
Carlton	4	3	4	0.4	0.3	0.4	5	4	6
Kool Ultra	4	-	-	0.4	-	-	4	-	-
Barclay	3	-	-	0.3	-	-	3	-	-
Now	2	1	-	0.2	0.2	-	1	1	-
Carlton (HP)	<0.5	<0.5	-	0.1	0.1	-	<0.5	1	-

*No Philip Morris Brands Included

PM3001060839

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xfkk0001